

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-14, 16-17 and 19-20 were amended solely to address the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 21-23 were added to further define the invention.

No new matter was added. The subject matter of new claims 21-23 is fully disclosed in the present specification. See, for example, Step 2 of Fig. 3B in the formal drawings, and original claim 5.

Withdrawal the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested for at least the reasons set forth below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 9, 11 and 19 were amended to address the antecedent basis issue. Corresponding dependent claims were amended for the same reason.

Applicant traverses the objection to the phrase, “the Internet.” The Internet is normally referred to in exactly this manner and an artisan would not find this phrase to be indefinite. Also, this accepted phraseology appears throughout the specification. If the phrase was changed to delete the word “the,” claims 1, 9, 11 and 19 would read, “...the user logs onto Internet...” or “...the user logs onto an Internet.” Both of these phrases would be considered to be grammatically awkward and/or incorrect.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Applicant’s admitted prior art (hereafter, “APA”). This rejection is traversed as it relates to the amended set of claims 1-23.

1. Patentability of claims 1, 9, 11 and 19

The present invention allows a user to supplement the display of a desired home web page with a floating window that displays a supplemental web page. Furthermore, the floating window is automatically launched when the user logs onto the Internet. Thus, the user does not

need to take any action to cause the floating window to appear when the user logs onto the Internet. This process is accomplished by providing a setup page that can retrieve or receive the supplemental web page address and by causing the browser to automatically navigate to the setup page address when the user logs onto the Internet.

The APA does not disclose or suggest any of the above-described features.

The Examiner asserts that the setup page address is equivalent to a “home page” or “start page” described on page 1, lines 18-19 of the specification. This is incorrect. The APA does not disclose or suggest the concept of a setup web page. The claims explicitly recite that there is a “desired home web page” and a “supplemental web page,” and that the floating window (which displays the supplemental web page) supplements the display of the desired web page. Thus, the claimed setup page address cannot be the home page or start page, but must be a different address. Since there is no setup page in the APA, neither steps (a) nor (b) of claims 1, 9, 11 and 19 are disclosed or suggested by the APA.

The Examiner also asserts that the process of launching a smaller “floating” window described on page 2, lines 12-13 of the specification discloses the step of automatically launching a floating window, wherein the floating window displays a supplemental web page. This is also incorrect. The claims explicitly recite “automatically launching the floating window” whereas the APA only describes the ability to manually launch a floating window with a single mouse click. The floating window described in the APA is thus not automatically launched when the user logs onto the Internet, as required by the present invention. The APA therefore lacks a significant feature of the present invention. Thus, step (c) of claims 1, 9, 11 and 19 is also not disclosed or suggested by the APA.

With respect to claim 9, the Examiner admits that the APA does not explicitly teach that the setup page receives a supplemental web page address. However, the Examiner refers to the APA regarding floating windows as suggesting this feature. This argument is also incorrect for at least the reasons discussed above. Specifically, the floating window referred to in the APA is not a setup page and does not launch automatically. Similar reasoning applies to corresponding features in the other independent claims.

In sum, the APA fails to disclose or suggest any of the steps (a), (b) or (c) in each of the independent claims. Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be patentable over the APA.

2. Patentability of dependent claims

The dependent claims are believed to be patentable because they depend from allowable independent claims and because they recite additional patentable features.

Claims 5 and 21-23 further require that the user select the supplemental web page and that the address of the selected supplemental web page becomes stored. The process described on page 2, lines 8-13 of the present specification does not perform the combination of these steps, and cannot perform these steps, particularly since there is no setup page to work with.

Furthermore, claims 21-23 recite that the user selects the supplemental web page from a “plurality of different web page addresses.” Again, the process described on page 2, lines 8-13 does not perform this function. If a user wants to launch a floating window for kvetch.com or anacam.com, a discrete set of software code will be provided for the purpose of launching a floating window for each of these web sites. That is, the software code for launching a floating window for kvetch.com and the software code for launching a floating window for anacam.com will not have anything to do with each other. One cannot use the kvetch.com software code for launching a floating window related to the contents of anacam.com, and vice-versa. In contrast to this conventional process, the present invention provides a setup web page which can receive user selected supplemental web page addresses for launching a floating window. Thus, in the present invention, one does not need to provide different software code for different supplemental web page addresses since the same setup web page (and its corresponding software code) is used every time to launch the floating window.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections were fully addressed, the instant application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowability of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BENJAMIN SLOTZNICK

October 13, 2004

(Date)

By: _____

Clark Jablon

CLARK A. JABLON

Registration No. 35,039

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street - Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Direct Dial: (215) 965-1293

Facsimile: (215) 965-1210

7282396 v2